

REQUEST FOR A RULING THAT JORDAN AND EVERMANN DID NOT DESIGNATE TYPE-SPECIES VALIDLY IN EITHER THEIR WORK DATED 1896-1900 OR THAT OF 1896 (PISCES). Z.N.(S.) 1279

By W. E. China (*Assistant Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

HISTORY OF THE CASE

On 6 June 1958, Dr. W. I. Follett and Dr. D. M. Cohen, published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 16 (part 2) : 73-78 an application to the Commission for a ruling as to the species to be accepted as the type-species of the nominal genus "*Bathylagus*" Günther (A.C.L.G.), 1878 (Class Pisces).

In paragraph 19 (p. 77) they requested that *Bathylagus antarcticus* Günther, 1878, should be ruled as type-species of *Bathylagus* by selection by Jordan, 1919 (*Genera of Fishes* (3) : 395).

2. On 8 September 1958, Mr. Melville received a comment from Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos, Mendham, New Jersey, U.S.A., supporting Follett's and Cohen's application. He wrote : " This request has been examined carefully and I find myself in complete agreement with the conclusions expressed in paragraphs 10, 13, 16, 17 and 19 thereof. While the search for a first reviser is often an elusive one, there is little chance that one occurred between 1878 when the names *Bathylagus antarcticus* and *B. atlanticus* were proposed, and 1919, when Jordan selected a logotype for that genus without such a selection having been discovered by the applicants or some other specialist."

3. On 15 September 1958, Eugenie Clark of the Cape Haze Marine Laboratory, Placida, Florida, U.S.A., wrote to the Commission supporting the application as follows :—

" I would like to support the request for a ruling that the type-species of the nominal genus *Bathylagus* is the nominal species *B. antarcticus* as well as the other four proposals made by Drs. Follett and Cohen."

4. On 20 March 1959 Follett in reply to a letter from Mr. Melville (25.ii.59) passing on certain criticisms from Dr. Lemche, which subsequently proved to be irrelevant, wrote, after consulting Cohen, as follows :—

" Our primary purpose in submitting this request for a ruling by the International Commission was, and is, as follows :—

" (1) To determine whether or not Jordan and Evermann (1896a, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 47(1):528) adequately selected the type-species despite the questionable matters noted in paragraphs 3 through 9 of our request (1958, *B.Z.N.* 16(2) : 73-75).

" (2) In case the Commission's answer to that question should be in the negative, then to determine whether or not Jordan & Evermann (1896, *Rept. U.S. Comm. Fish and Fish.* 21 : 295) adequately selected the type-species despite the questionable matters noted in paragraphs 11 through 13 of our request (1958, *B.Z.N.*, 16(2) : 75).

" You will note that in the case of *Bathylagus*, Jordan and Evermann's

reference to 'the species taken by the describer as the type of the genus' is demonstrably erroneous, since the original describer (Günther) gave no indication whatever of 'taking' either one of the species as type.

"When Dr. Cohen first consulted me with regard to this problem, I told him that the question appeared to be a close one, but that if Rule (g) in Article 30 ('The meaning of the expression "select the type", is to be rigidly construed') were to be interpreted as having any effect, I thought that both of the foregoing actions of Jordan and Evermann would have to be regarded as insufficient to constitute a selection of the type. Dr. Cohen then told me that if Jordan and Evermann's two purported 'selections' were to be rejected, Jordan's (1919, *Genera of Fishes* (3) : 394-395) selection of *Bathylagus antarcticus* would apparently prevail (as noted in paragraphs 14 through 16 of our request). Dr. Cohen pointed out that there would be certain advantages in such a result because *Bathylagus antarcticus* is a better-known species than *Bathylagus atlanticus*.

"However, had Dr. Cohen and I not been convinced that the circumstances described in our request demonstrated the inadequacy of Jordan and Evermann's purported 'selections', we should not have requested a ruling that *Bathylagus antarcticus* be deemed the type-species.

"As I explained in my letter of 21 October 1957 to Mr. Francis Hemming : 'The problem is of more than ordinary interest, since it involves the question whether type-species were selected by Jordan and Evermann in their monumental work entitled "Fishes of North and Middle America", published in four volumes as Bulletin 47 of the United States National Museum, 1896-1900'. Dr. Cohen and I would not have requested a ruling that Jordan and Evermann (1896a) did not select the type, if we had not been convinced that the Rules required such an interpretation.

"In your letter of 25 February 1959, you state that *Bathylagus atlanticus* 'is clearly the valid type-species of the genus'. If this is so, you have answered our query, in part. However, you have not explained whether you reached this conclusion (1) on the basis that Jordan and Evermann (1896a, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 47(1) : 528) adequately selected the type despite the questionable matters that Dr. Cohen and I pointed out, or (2) on the basis that Jordan and Evermann (1896a) inadequately selected the type, but that Jordan and Evermann (1896, *Rept. U.S. Comm. Fish and Fish.*) adequately selected the type. Dr. Cohen and I are greatly interested in learning on which basis the Commission reaches its decision, and we believe that every ichthyologist who is concerned with the fish fauna of North America will be equally interested, even if he is not concerned with the immediate problem of *Bathylagus*. We therefore urge that the Commission's decision leave no room for doubt as to its basis.

"In your letter of 25 February 1959, you suggest also that Dr. Cohen and I request some specialist to examine the type-material and to publish a paper putting the status of the species beyond reasonable doubt. We believe that this has already been done by Günther (1887, *Deep-sea Fish.* 'Challenger', 22 : 219-221) and by Norman (1930, *Discovery Reports* 2 : 274-277). Both of those eminent ichthyologists referred the species *atlanticus* and the species

antarcticus to the genus *Bathylagus*. We know of no one who has done otherwise.

"At the expense of repetition, I wish to make it clear that Dr. Cohen and I do not contend that the species *antarcticus* should be the type-species for any reason other than our belief that the Rules require it."

Melville, 23 March 1959, replied to Follett's letter as follows :—

"On reading your original application more carefully in the light of your letter I see that I had misunderstood it as a definite request to set aside a valid designation of *atlanticus* as type-species of *Bathylagus* in favour of *antarcticus*. I think this also must have been the impression that Dr. Lemche got when he sent in his comment. I see now that there is no valid reason for accepting either Jordan and Evermann, 1896, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 47 : 528 or Jordan & Evermann, 1896, *Rept. U.S. Comm. Fish and Fish.* 21 : 295 as having designated *atlanticus* as type-species, rigidly construed."

5. Melville sent a copy of Follett's letter to Lemche and wrote to him : "I should like to say that I thought there was some ground for your criticism, but that it now appears that I at least misunderstood the application. It seems that Follett and Cohen genuinely believe Jordan's 1919 selection of *antarcticus* to be the first valid selection, but there is sufficient doubt about this to make an application to the Commission necessary.

"You will see from Dr. Follett's letter that he and Dr. Cohen do not consider either of the references by Jordan and Evermann 1896 (in two separate papers) as valid type designations 'rigidly construed', the first because it rests on whether the original describer took a particular species as the type of the genus (which Günther did not, in the case of *Bathylagus*) and the other because it consists merely of the citation of one specific name in combination with the generic name, without any indication of a purpose to designate the type-species. You will also see that their contention in favour of *antarcticus* is based on their reading of the Rules as applied to this case, not on the question of suitability. I want to frame this letter in such a way that your reply will be the last step in the case before the issue of the voting paper. I think that the best way to achieve this will be to ask you to explain what is in your view the first valid designation of a type-species for *Bathylagus*. If you conclude that under the Rules *atlanticus* is the type-species, in terms of a cited reference, then I should propose to submit a call for Alternative A (*antarcticus*) or for Alternative B (*atlanticus*), with a summary of the correspondence. If you concur with Follett and Cohen in thinking *antarcticus* to be the valid type-species, then I should call for a vote for or against *antarcticus* with a brief summary of the correspondence intended to meet the same objection should it arise in the minds of any other members of the Commission."

6. Lemche's reply was received by Melville on 17 June 1959. He wrote :—

"It now turns out that what the Commission is going to decide is not the isolated case of *Bathylagus* and its type, but the more general question of whether Jordan and Evermann in their important paper of 1896–1900, 'The Fishes of North and Middle America', 1–4, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 47, did establish types by citing single specific names after the genera mentioned. Follett and Cohen state that Jordan and Evermann did not so select types and

they cite some examples to show that Jordan and Evermann were so irregular in their actions that they cannot be regarded as having selected types as 'rigidly construed' in a nomenclatorial sense."

Lemche went on to state that he had now studied the original paper by Jordan and Evermann and had come to exactly the opposite conclusion to that of Follett and Cohen. He considered that the invariable citation of a single specific name after new generic and subgeneric names constituted a type-selection. He quoted a number of examples which he said showed that Jordan and Evermann really intended to fix types even if they had not done so validly.

He concluded: "To me there is no doubt that Jordan and Evermann had the idea that in their paper all genera had been cited with types. They start in the first line of their synonymies with giving the original content of the genus, then following the history of it through restrictions—clearly so designated—until only one species is left to function as type*. In all cases, it is in some way or other clearly stated what species is a type. Whether or not they have put the word 'type' in close connection to the specific name in question cannot be a decisive factor. I am, therefore, of the opinion that Jordan and Evermann (1896) did select types when they added a single specific name behind the citation of a generic one in cases where no type-selection had already been undertaken. I maintain that the said authors executed their right to establish a type in the case of *Bathylagus*, *atlanticus* being the type under the Rules, by subsequent selection by Jordan and Evermann 1896. Consequently, I find no need for any special decision of the Commission in the case of *Bathylagus*, but it may be appropriate to bring an end to all doubts by requesting the Commission to adopt the following Decision:

"The authors D. S. Jordan and B. W. Evermann, in their work "The Fishes of North and Middle America 1-4", *Bull. U.S. Nat. Mus.* 47: 1896-1900, are accepted as having executed their rights of type-selection "as rigidly construed" under the Rules by following their habit of placing single specific names in parentheses after their first citation of several generic ones'".

7. Melville (18 June 1959) wrote to Follett enclosing a copy of Lemche's statement. He pointed out that there were only two alternative methods of settling Follett's application, either of which would involve some delay. They were:—

(1) "If Jordan and Evermann did not fix *atlanticus* as the type-species of *Bathylagus* in their first 1896 paper, then the case must proceed on the line indicated in Follett's and Cohen's application. If they did, then *atlanticus* is the type-species through their action and it only remains to justify the point of view. This cannot be done without adducing the argument that they designated type-species for all the genera mentioned in their work other than those for which a valid designation or indication already existed. However true this may be on purely nomenclatural grounds, it would be impossible to put a responsible proposal before the Commission to validate those selections as a whole without a thorough examination of all the names involved, preferably

* Fixation by restriction!—W.E.C.

by an ichthyologist. To sum up, this alternative really amounts to a request for a ruling that Jordan and Evermann did in fact make type-designations of the kind mentioned, and the fact that *atlanticus* was thereby the type-species of *Bathylagus* would be only an incidental feature in a broader picture. No exercise of the plenary powers would be involved, but the amount of work required to establish the position might be formidable.

(2) "Without taking into consideration the general question of whether Jordan and Evermann in general designated type-species in their first 1896 paper or not, it would be possible to use the plenary powers to set aside all previous designations so as to fix *antarcticus* as the type-species of *Bathylagus*. This would require supporting evidence that the action proposed was in the interests of stability and uniformity of nomenclature, or words to that effect; in other words it would require at least a 'reasoned prejudice' in your own minds in favour of one species.

"The first alternative would require a detailed examination of Jordan and Evermann's work in the light of current taxonomic usage and of relevant earlier literature before it could be decided to what extent, if any, their alleged general type-designations are valid. The second alternative, which requires the use of the plenary powers, would necessitate a new start, with a paper in the *Bulletin* and an advertisement of the possible use of the plenary powers."

8. Melville at the same time also wrote to Lemche disagreeing with him that the Commission is, in effect, being asked to rule on the question whether Jordan and Evermann designated types for all the genera cited in their first 1896 paper. Follett and Cohen, he wrote, only asked for the acceptance of *antarcticus* as the type-species of *Bathylagus* because they thought that that was the type-species under the Rules.

"A decision", wrote Melville, "that Jordan and Evermann effectively designated types for all the genera in their paper, except where a type had been previously designated or indicated, could not be taken without a great deal more advice from specialists than we at present have, since such a ruling might have the most serious taxonomic implications. As far as the individual case of *Bathylagus* is concerned, however, it would be difficult for the Commission to rule that they had designated *atlanticus* as the type-species in their first 1896 paper without explaining they had done so as part of a wholesale series of such designations. Follett and Cohen clearly believe that Jordan and Evermann did not designate a type for *Bathylagus* (and would presumably also be of the view that they did not designate types as a general rule in that paper). It is also clear that they consider *antarcticus* as the type-species under the Rules because it was the first species to be so designated 'as rigidly construed'. My own view is that, if there are not too many taxonomic difficulties, the Commission would probably accept your view as to the status of designations in Jordan and Evermann's first 1896 paper, except where previous valid designations or indications exist. A proposal to the Commission on those lines would, however, demand considerable research by one or more specialists and it would be desirable to obtain a widespread expression of the views of other ichthyologists on the results of that research. The alternative would be to redraft the present case on the following lines:

'Without prejudice to the general question, it is proposed that the plenary powers be used to designate *antarcticus* as the type-species of *Bathylagus* after using the same powers to set aside all previous designations.'

"This would involve publication of a new application in the *Bulletin* and the issue of Public Notices, since the existing application (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 16 (part 2) : 73-78, 1958) does not entail use of the plenary powers."

9. Lemche in his reply (23 June 1959) agreed with Melville's view that a decision to accept Jordan and Evermann's types in a wholesale manner was dangerous unless ichthyologists are consulted on a broad base. But he insisted that it was equally dangerous to state that they did not so select types. He advised that the general principle involved should be decided by the Commission at the same time as the *Bathylagus* case, whimsically ignoring the vast amount of work that would need to be done by the very small Secretariat before it was possible to place the required evidence before the Commission.

10. Follett (18 July 1959) replying to Melville's letter wrote :—

"We believe that the Commission should not make its ruling without a direct reference to the requirement of Article 30g that 'The meaning of the expression, select the type, is to be rigidly construed'. Whichever way the ruling may go, it is possible that undesirable results may ensue when that ruling is applied to other genera cited by Jordan and Evermann. Then and then only should resort be had to the plenary powers. We note Dr. Lemche's comment that the decision will involve the more general question of whether Jordan and Evermann (1896a) selected type-species for all the genera that they cited. We believe that this consideration cannot properly be allowed to influence the decision in the present case. A decision so influenced would amount to a surreptitious use of the plenary powers."

11. Melville replied, stating that he agreed with Lemche that, "the Commission could not deliver a ruling about *Bathylagus* in Jordan and Evermann's first 1896 work without at the same time ruling on all the other generic names in that work. A ruling that those authors had fixed the type-species of *Bathylagus* in that work would imply that they had also done so for all the other genera where the question of the fixation of the type-species was still open; a ruling that they had not fixed the type-species of *Bathylagus* would imply that they had not fixed the type-species of any genus."

"My own view", wrote Melville, "is that purely on the basis of internal evidence, and without considering the relationship of Jordan and Evermann 1896a to Jordan and Gilbert 1883, type-species *were not fixed* in that work in the sense of Article 30 Rule g. 'rigidly construed'. It seems clear, however, that they did effectively fix types in their 1896b Check List, for the following reason. On page 210, they say: 'The name in parenthesis following the reference to the generic name is that of the species taken by the describer as the type of the genus'. The Paris Congress (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 182) added a provision to Rule g in Article 30 (New Code Art. 69(a)iii) that an author had validly designated a type-species even if he states or implies, either correctly or otherwise, that that nominal species had been selected by some previous author to be the type-species of that nominal genus... provided that the author concerned makes it clear that he himself accepts, for whatever reason, the

species in question as the type-species of the genus concerned *. In the light of this rule (which still stands), it seems to me that Jordan and Evermann 1896b, definitely designated type-species, and those designations should stand, in so far as they are valid in all other respects. But here too, a ruling in this sense relating to *Bathylagus* would apply equally to all the other generic names in the work to which the question can apply. Thus, whichever of the two 1896 works is accepted as the one in which the type-species was fixed for *Bathylagus*, the same problem of the taxonomic implications of accepting the wholesale deal has to be tackled. As there are something over 1,000 generic names involved, the problem could be a formidable one."

12. A copy of Melville's letter was sent to Lemche. He replied (28 December 1959): "Dr. Cohen and Mr. Follett argue that the authors did not use the formal way of type selecting as prescribed half a century later. I quite agree. But why should we ask for such formalities: there must be a limit to retroactive actions. My view is that we must be realistic and accept as a selection any statement running like 'the type is —', and reject any 'the author N.N. regarded — as the type' or 'this species is a typical one'. But to ask almost for a formal 'I herewith select — as the type', in papers published long before rulings to that end had ever even been thought of, that is to go too far."

"So, I still hold that Jordan and Evermann did select types in 1896 and I propose that we put this general question before the Commission in advance to any special case such as *Bathylagus*. But, before voting, please let us know the consequence if these type-selections are rejected. They might be grave."

13. On 20 December Follett replied to Melville's letter of 22 July 1959 as follows:—

"We believe that the conflicting considerations with regard to Jordan and Evermann 1896a have been adequately presented by our application on the one hand and by Dr. Lemche's comments on the other. I wrote to you further not with the thought of persuading the International Commission to decide this problem in the manner that we have suggested, but rather to explain our reasons for believing that the solution of the problem leans more toward the direction that we have pointed out than toward the opposite direction . . . Dr. Cohen and I contend that, Jordan and Evermann, *did not make it clear* that they themselves accepted, for whatever reason, the species in question as the type-species of the genus concerned. Those authors, it seems to us, merely reported, without acceptance or rejection, 'the species taken by the describer as the type of the genus'. In other words, the present situation impresses us as similar to that involved in Opinion 275, where as you will recall, the International Commission ruled as follows:

"The statement by Grote (1865) that Hübner, when establishing the nominal genus *Amphyterus* Hübner, [1819] (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), had evidently regarded *A. ganascus* (Stoll) "as the typical species of his genus" does not constitute the selection by Grote, under Rule (g) Article 30, of that species as the type-species of the foregoing genus, for Grote gave no indication that he himself accepted the above species as the type-species of this genus'.

* But this Jordan & Evermann did not do!—W.E.C.

"We believe that the requirement of Rule (g) in Article 30 ('the meaning of the expression "select the type" is to be rigidly construed') applies quite as well to the situation covered by *B.Z.N.* 4 : 182, as to any other situation involving the subsequent selection of a type-species. We therefore believe that the words 'made it clear' (which I have emphasized above) must themselves be rigidly construed."

PRESENT POSITION

14. Nothing more was done with the case which seemed to have reached a deadlock, when Mr. Melville left the service of the Commission on 1 November 1959 to return to his former work on the Geological Survey. On 14 June 1961, Dr. Cohen, while working in the Fish Section of the Zoological Department of the British Museum (Natural History), paid a visit to the Secretariat of the Commission and inquired about the *Bathylagus* case. It was agreed that the case should be revived.

It seems to the writer that Dr. Lemche was hardly justified in interrupting the progress of Follett and Cohen's case through the process of submission for a vote. Reading the evidence it is clear that there is a strong doubt as to whether, rigidly construed, Jordan and Evermann validly designated types in their 1896a work. The new Code (Art. 67c) follows the old Rules (Art. 30g) in stating that the term designation in relation to the fixation of a type-species must be rigidly construed; a designation made in an ambiguous or qualified manner is invalid. It will be seen that Melville himself in (13) above stated: "type-species were not fixed in that work in the sense of Article 30 Rule g 'rigidly construed'." Follett and Cohen clearly demonstrated the fact. Lemche in his final comment, (14) above, also agreed that Jordan and Evermann did not use the formal way of type selecting as prescribed half a century later. But he still persisted that the general question should be submitted to the Commission although he admitted the consequences might be grave.

The impracticability of checking the consequences of the validation or invalidation of the type-citations for all the 1,000 fish genera listed in Jordan and Evermann's work seems not to have been considered by Dr. Lemche. Such wholesale assignments cannot be carried out effectively by the Secretariat of the Commission and must be done by the specialists themselves. The Meigen case, *Z.N.(S.)* 191, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 18 (part 1) : 9-64, is an example of what happens when such cases are considered by the Secretariat in respect of all their implications.

There is also a legal precedent for the *Bathylagus* case in Opinion 275 quoted by Follett. There appears to be no reason at all why under the proper interpretation of the Code, Jordan and Evermann's 1896 (*Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 47(1)) so-called type-designations should be regarded as valid. The omission of the word type, which was given in Jordan and Evermann's Synopsis of the Fishes of North America 1883 in front of the cited specific name, in effect made the cited specific names in the 1896 revision, merely examples and not type-species.

There is, however, some doubt as to whether Jordan and Evermann did or did not fix types in their second 1896 work *Rept. U.S. Comm. Fish and Fish.* 21. As stated by Follett and Cohen, paragraph 12, in their preface to this later work Jordan and Evermann wrote as follows: "The name in parenthesis following the reference to the generic name is that of the species taken by the describer as the type of the genus." Now, in respect of the case under consideration at least, this statement was quite wrong because Günther did not select either of his two originally included species as the type of the genus *Bathylagus*. Nonetheless, Article 69(a)(iii) of the new Code (subsequent designation) states "an author is considered to have designated one of the originally included species as type-species, if he states that it is the type (or type-species), for whatever reason, right or wrong, and if it is clear that he himself accepted it as the type-species." Melville (13) above on the basis of this ruling, stated that "it seems clear, however, that they did effectively fix types in their 1896b Check List." But did Jordan and Evermann by the statement in the preface to the second work really make it clear that they accepted the nominal species in parentheses as the type-species of the genera listed? Follett and Cohen do not think so and if Jordan had really meant to designate the type of *Bathylagus* as *atlanticus* in his 1896 works, he would not have designated *antarcticus* in his 1919 work. This seems to the writer conclusive evidence that Jordan and Evermann were not themselves actually citing types in their 1896 works. Melville, himself, stated (6) above "I see now that there is no valid reason for accepting either Jordan and Evermann 1896, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* 47 : 528 or Jordan and Evermann 1896, *Rept. U.S. Comm. Fish and Fish.* 21 : 295 as having designated *atlanticus* as type-species, rigidly construed". The writer is of the opinion that by a strict interpretation of the Rules Jordan and Evermann did not make it clear that they accepted the species cited as the type-species of the genera involved and no action is required by the Commission in either case on this score.

15. Nevertheless in order to clear up this Case and to complete the application of Follett and Cohen Z.N.(S.) 1279, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 16 (Part 2) : 73-78, the International Commission is requested to take the following action:—

- (1) to give a ruling that Jordan and Evermann did not validly designate type-species (as prescribed by the Code) either in their work *Fishes of North and Middle America* (*Bull. U.S. Nat. Mus.* 47, 1896-1900) or in their Check List of the Fishes and Fish-like Vertebrates of North & Middle America (*Rept. Commissioner of Fish & Fish. for 1895*, Appendix 5 : 207-584, 1896). Any cases of hardship due to this ruling to be submitted to the Commission for decision by use of the plenary powers if necessary.
- (2) to place the undermentioned generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :
 - (a) *Bathylagus* Günther, 1878 (gender : masculine) (type-species by selection by Jordan 1919, *Genera of Fishes* (3) : 395, *Bathylagus antarcticus* Günther, 1878);
 - (b) *Argentina* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender : feminine) (type-species by monotypy : *Argentina sphyraena* Linnaeus, 1758);

- (3) to place the undermentioned specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology :
- (a) *antarcticus* Günther, 1878, as published in the binomen *Bathylagus antarcticus* (type-species of *Bathylagus* Günther, 1878) ;
 - (b) *sphyraena* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Argentina sphyraena* (type-species of *Argentina* Linnaeus, 1758);
- (4) to place the undermentioned family-group names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology :
- (a) BATHYLAGIDAE Gill, 1884 (type-genus : *Bathylagus* Günther, 1878) ;
 - (b) ARGENTININAE (correction of ARGENTININI) Bonaparte, 1846 (type-genus : *Argentina* Linnaeus, 1758);
- (5) to place the undermentioned family-group name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology : ARGENTININI Bonaparte, 1846 (type-genus *Argentina* Linnaeus, 1758) (an Invalid Original Spelling for ARGENTININAE but available as the name for a taxon within the family-group belonging to a category for which there is no prescribed termination).

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *PANOPEA* MÉNARD DE LA GROYE, 1807 (BIVALVIA). Z.N.(S.) 1049

(see volume 18, pages 184-188)

By Robert Robertson (*Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.*)

I recently have noticed that Vokes and Cox have applied to the Commission to place the family name GLYCYMERIDAE Stewart, 1930, on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology. Although the six month protest period has lapsed, I have decided that I should draw your attention to a publication by H. B. Stenzel, E. L. Krause and J. T. Twining (*Univ. Texas publ.* 5704, 1957) in which it is shown (pp. 59-60) that this family name should be spelled GLYCYMERIDIDAE, not GLYCYMERIDAE.

One further matter : Vokes and Cox claim (p. 185) that the spelling *Panopea* is " much more widely used " than *Panope*. This is not so. I have tallied usage for the last 30 years from the *Zoological Record* (1929-1958).

Panopea has been used 14 times

Panope has been used 12 times

Panopaea has been used 11 times

During the last twelve years abstracted by the *Zoological Record* (1947-1958), the spelling *Panope* has been used seven times, and *Panopea* only three times. Since the time of Dall, American workers have almost consistently used the spelling *Panope*. So have workers in some other countries.